

January 18, 1958

Dear Jim:

I hasten to reply to yours of the 15th, which I was glad to receive. I had been getting a bit discouraged over not having heard from you, but I should know that you would be the first to keep me in touch with developments especially if there should be any significant snags.

This will not be much more than an acknowledgment: I have to think about the implications of all that was in your letter. One point I am confused about: Stage I was estimated as costing \$145,000, while Browne thought that 'a satisfactory laboratory' would be consistent with the 100,000 now available. Does he mean that another block of space would be left unfinished or that a lower grade of furnishing would be required. Does this \$100,000 include the apparatus estimate? I realize you would need more information from me for a full answer, but I would like to know the basis of your own thinking as far as it has gone.

I will of course count on a trip out if, or rather as soon as, indicated. One issue I will have to have your advice about is the strength of the assurance that the remaining funds will become available. If there were no other recourse, I imagine we could start our operations in the space indicated as 'first stage', though this will depend on the level of equipment, but it would be painful to contemplate continuing anxieties and postponements on when the job would be finished. I do not expect you to be able to answer a fuzzy question like this by mail.

I imagine that you and the Department are much relieved by the outcome of the discussions with Zoology, which seems to me entirely sound from both your points of view. There is one sentence in Morgan Harris' letter of Dec. 26 that seems to me, however, to pinpoint the trouble, and I wonder that you would want that premise to go unchallenged. If that conception of the role of the Genetics Department becomes fixed policy, you will be in for the same trouble again and again. He wrote "The Department of Genetics as a unit in Agriculture can hardly escape its primary responsibilities for applied studies in plant and animal breeding. Under these circumstances it is unlikely that genetics will be more successful than Zoology has been in presenting genetics on a broad base..." Dean Constance's reply of the 27th alluded only to the "peculiar position and role of the Department of Genetics", and it is not certain to my mind that this is a refutation of Harris' implication. The latter is certainly not my view of the primary mission of the Department; it would be inconsistent with the magnanimous effort you are making to find a place for me there, and I had the impression from you that the Department had even less of a responsibility for applied breeding than does the Genetics Department here! But as long as responsible people like Harris hold such views, even if they are not shared by the Administration, you are bound to have

relapses.


The whole situation is rather nerve-wracking, but it is good to see that the end, or the path to the end, is in sight. You already know that I have rather blithely (I hope not too casually) turned down or parried several other very attractive offers on the basis that Berkeley was the best of them, and I will be very much relieved when it is certain that this last was not too good to be true.

Are you running your cytogenetics series again? If so, would you want my visit to tie in with the course? -- which might excite less premature commotion.

One of the bogdowns here has been the symposium--program enclosed. I was glad to note that UC will be represented by Stuart Lindsay, from the medical school, as well as by Curt.

To raise an altogether different question, the University of Wisconsin very badly needs a new staff member equipped and interested to teach cytogenetics. If you have any suggestions, preferably for someone at the assistant professorship stage, or can elicit any from Spencer or your other colleagues, I'd be much obliged to hear them.

As ever


Joshua Lederberg